

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,035	12/28/2001	Young Ho Bae	2658-0280P 3483	
	7590 01/11/200 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747	CH, VA 22040-0747	KACKAR, RAM N		
FALLS CHUR	CH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1763	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/11/2007	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/029,035	BAE, YOUNG HO		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Ram N. Kackar	1763		

<u> </u>		7.00	1
•	Ram N. Kackar	1763	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 08 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS		•	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
time periods:  a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)); to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of le appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further co</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bel appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	·		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil vided below or appended.	l be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:	·		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. So	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ied.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowar	ice because:
<ol> <li>Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> <li>☐ Other:</li> </ol>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	•	Runde	
		Ram Kackar Primary Examiner	AU1763

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The new issues pertain to amendments to claims 12 and 15. In claim12 new addition of sliding portion being in two parts is not understood since, sliding portion is supposed to be planer. This further needs consideration in view of the specification and further determination. Regarding claim 15, robot arm configured to incline the substrate at 85 degrees is not understood since the incline is associated with weight and size of the substrate and not a part of the structure of the claimed apparatus. Further consideration is required. Still further, amendments to specification and drawings also need consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As discussed above, the amendments need further consideration but it does not appear that the structure of the apparatus has been amended so that it now distinguishes over the prior art.